

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed September 6, 2007 has been carefully considered together with each of the references cited therein. The amendments and remarks presented herein are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration of the present Application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant has amended the application to attend to housekeeping and to protect what Applicant believes to be the invention. In Claim 7, the obvious typographical error in the term "0.5 to 20% by weight" was replaced with the term -- 0.5 to 20% by weight--. Support for the amendment to claim 7 may be found in originally filed claim 7. In claims 2 and 15 the subject matter within the parentheses was amended to replace the mixture of text and parenthetical text with a clear description of the elements of the invention. The terms were amended for clarity in the following manner:

"alkyl sulfate (a number of carbon atoms in the alkyl group is 8 to 18)" was replaced with the term --C₈₋₁₈alkyl sulfate--

"polyoxyethylene (an average number of added moles is 1 to 4) alkyl sulfate (a number of carbon atoms in the alkyl group is 8 to 18)" was replaced with the term --polyoxyethylene alkyl sulfate having from 1 to 4 ethylene oxide added moles and an alkyl group of from 8 to 18 carbon atoms--

" α -olefin sulfonate (a number of carbon atoms in the alkyl group is 10 to 18)" was replaced with the term -- α -olefin sulfonate having an alkyl group of from 10 to 18 carbon atoms--

"alkyl benzene sulfonate (a number of carbon atoms in the alkyl group is 8 to 18)" was replaced with the term -- C₈₋₁₈alkyl benzene sulfonate--;

"alkyl dimethyl acetic acid betaine (a number of carbon atoms in the alkyl group is 8 to 18)", was replaced with the term -- C₈₋₁₈alkyl dimethyl acetic acid betaine--

"alkyl dimethyl amine oxide (a number of carbon atoms in the alkyl group is 8 to 18)" was replaced with the term -- C₈₋₁₈alkyl dimethyl amine oxide --

"polyoxyethylene (an average number of added moles is 3 to 12) undecyl alcohol" was replaced with the term -- polyoxyethylene undecyl alcohol having an average number of ethylene oxide added moles of from 3 to 12--

"polyoxyethylene (an average number of added moles is 3 to 12) alkyl ether (a number of carbon atoms in the alkyl group is 8 to 18)" was replaced with the term -- polyoxyethylene undecyl alcohol C₈₋₁₈alkyl ether having an average number of ethylene oxide added moles of from 3 to 12--

"polyoxyethylene (an average number of ethylene oxide added moles is 3 to 12) nonyl phenyl ether" was replaced with the term --polyoxyethylene nonyl phenyl ether having an average number of ethylene oxide added moles of from 3 to 12--

Support for the amendments to claims 2 and 15 may be found in originally filed claims 2 and 15. It is believed that no new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

The objection to claim 7 because of informalities related to the obvious typographical error which was not earlier noticed in the term "0.5 t o 2 0% by weight" should be withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

Claims 2, 8-11, and 15-17 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The rejection of claims 2 and 15 as amended under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention should be withdrawn in view of the above amendments which more clearly recite the terms of the claims without the parenthetical expressions as noted above.. The rejection of claims 2, 8-11 and 16-17 under 35 USC §112, second

Attorney's Docket: 2002JP302Serial No.: 10/S06.874Response to Final Rejection mailed 09/06/2007

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention should be withdrawn for the reasons given in support of claims 2 and 15 and in view of the above amendments which more clearly recite that which the Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant notes that claims 1, 3-7 and 12-14 are considered as allowable over the prior art of record for the reason that the prior art neither teaches nor suggests the claimed solution that contains an anionic surfactant, an amphoteric surfactant, and a non-ionic surfactant.

It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the above remarks, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 should be withdrawn and that this application is in a condition for an allowance of all pending claims. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and an allowance of all pending claims are courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard P. Silverman, Agent for
Applicant Registration No. 36,277

(CUSTOMER NUMBER 25,255)

CLARIANT CORPORATION
INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
4000 Monroe Road
Charlotte, NC 28205
Phone (704) 331-7156
Fax (704) 331-7707